

GARI SCHUMACHER, 1817: COMMENTS ON DR. H. LEMCHE'S PROPOSALS
By L. R. Cox (British Museum (Natural History), London). Z.N.(S.) 1461

As instigator of the original proposals relating to the above nominal genus, I should like to offer some comments on Dr. Lemche's "Revised Proposals" (1964, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 : 323-5). These coincide with mine except in two matters. I am prepared to accept Dr. Lemche's recommendations on one of these but not on the other. An important point is involved which is likely to arise again when lectotypes are selected by reference to artist-drawn illustrations.

As very divergent views as to the identity of *Tellina gari* Linnaeus have been expressed by those who wrote criticizing my proposal that a neotype conforming with Chemnitz's interpretation on the species should be established, I am not opposing Dr. Lemche's suggestion that the name should be suppressed. The next available name for the species to which my proposed neotype belongs should at the same time be placed on the Official List. The name in question is *Tellina truncata* Linnaeus (1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) : 1118), the holotype of which was illustrated in my original application (1960, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18, pl. 1, figs. 2a-d). This would not displace any name that has become established in the literature.

To come, now, to the main point of this note. Exception must be taken to Dr. Lemche's statement that Schumacher's *Gari vulgaris* "is defined by its extant type-specimen", as if there were only one specimen concerned. The identification of *G. vulgaris* must be based on a lectotype selected from Schumacher's syntypes. By referring to the two figures published by Chemnitz (1782, *Conch. Cab.* 6, pl. 10, figs. 92, 93) Schumacher made the specimens illustrated available as syntypes of *G. vulgaris*, the more so as it seems clear from Dr. Lemche's researches that these specimens were studied by Schumacher; they may, in fact, have been the only material seen by him. Dr. Lemche has discovered from an associated label in the handwriting of the conchologist O. A. L. Morch that the original of Chemnitz's fig. 93 was the specimen of which the interior of both valves was figured by Schumacher in illustration of the hinge-structure of *G. vulgaris*, although this would not have been apparent without the label, as the relative size of the hinge-teeth is greatly exaggerated in his figures. Schumacher's choice of this specimen to illustrate the characters of the hinge does not, however, make it the holotype of *G. vulgaris*.

The earliest and, up to the present time, the only selection of a lectotype for *G. vulgaris* has been by myself (1961, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18 : 226), and I chose the original of Chemnitz's fig. 92. Dr. Lemche, however, finds that two specimens are now associated with a label referring to this illustration, and, while both belong to the species illustrated, he is unable to say which was the original of the figure. Either a second specimen has been added or (as Dr. Lemche considers probable) the figure was composite. Dr. Lemche argues that the existence of a second specimen makes the lectotype selection invalid, so that the unique original of fig. 93 (which belongs to a species long considered to be distinct from fig. 92) must, by elimination, be the type-specimen of *G. vulgaris*.

This case suggests that the rule permitting the selection of a lectotype by reference to its published illustration needs amplification, if any selection can be held to be invalid when uncertainty is expressed as to which of two or more specimens was the actual one drawn by the artist; or as to whether an illustration, based partly or even mainly on one specimen, was completed by reference to another. It is now suggested that, once uncertainty has been expressed, an opportunity should be given to the reviser to declare which specimen is to be regarded as the original of the figure he has selected. This would be preferable to declaring all of the possible originals of the figure to be ineligible for selection as lectotype.

As *Gari vulgaris* is a junior synonym (of *Tellina truncata* Linnaeus or of *Solen amethystus* Wood) whether it is restricted to the fig. 92 species or to the fig. 93 one, the essential issue in the present case is which of these species is to be accepted as type-species of *Gari*. The principle of established usage does not enter into the question,

as the various species cited as such in the literature do not include these and are unavailable by the provisions of the International Code. It would also probably be asked which of the two species concerned would best suit the convenience of workers in general. Dr. Lemche, in support of his preference for *Solen amethystus*, states that this comes from the "geographical area wanted", but is not clear why anybody should want it to come from any particular area, Schumacher having made no statement regarding the distribution of his species and genus. Dr. Lemche also makes the point that *Tellina fervensis* Gmelin, type-species of *Psammobia* Lamarck, needs separating, as an Atlantic species, at least subgenerically from the Indo-West Pacific species *Solen amethystus*, so that, if the latter is accepted as type-species of *Gari*, the familiar but junior name *Psammobia* could also be retained. While I am fully aware that taxonomic separation is a subjective matter, I can merely say that, after careful comparison of specimens of *amethystus* and *fervensis*, I have failed to detect any morphological characters, either internal or external, which would justify the reference of these species to different genera or subgenera. I would certainly object to the principle of basing taxonomic separation on geographical distribution.

Tellina truncata, on the other hand, is unique among the Psammobiidae for its strongly discrepant ornament, the well-defined ribbing on the anterior part of its surface being oblique (as shown in fig. 1a of my original application) in contrast to the weak concentric ornament of *Psammobia fervensis*. For this reason many modern systematists would separate these two species subgenerically and possibly generically. The conclusion from this line of argument is that conservation of the name *Psammobia* as well as of *Gari* would be best brought about by the decision that *Tellina truncata* rather than *Solen amethystus* should be accepted as type-species of the latter nominal genus.

I would thus strongly support Dr. Lemche's "revised proposals" except for the following suggested modifications:

Section 3 (pp. 324-5 of Dr. Lemche's proposals) to read as follows:

(3) place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

- (a) *truncata* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Tellina truncata* [the oldest available name for *Gari vulgaris* Schumacher, 1817, as defined by the lectotype designation of Cox, 1961; type-species of *Gari* Schumacher, 1817];
- (b) *amethystus* Wood, 1815, as published in the binomen *Solen amethystus* Wood;
- (c) *fervensis* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Tellina fervensis* (type-species of *Psammobia* Lamarck, 1818);
- (d) *filosa* Conrad, 1833, as published in the binomen *Psammobia filosa* (type-species of *Garum* Dall, 1900).